



CITY OF LODI COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

AGENDA TITLE: Receive Report and Recommendation on the Preferred General Plan Alternative

MEETING DATE: February 11, 2009

PREPARED BY: Community Development Department

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Receive report and recommendation on the Preferred General Plan Alternative.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The attached report provides an overview of the Draft Preferred Plan. This plan reflects the concepts of the various alternatives that have been discussed and presented to date. The plan is the Draft as recommended by the Planning Commission at its December 18, 2008 meeting. Staff is now suggesting that the City Council receive additional input from the public as well as discuss any issues as you see fit. While this plan is an important milestone as it will provide the basis for development of the Draft General Plan and Environmental Impact Report, it is not the final document. It will likely see additional changes along the process of preparing the final documents, including changes based on this discussion.

As noted in the report, this plan builds from some of the concepts of Alternative "C" Sketch Plan which was one of three alternatives presented in May. The plan emphasizes an infill and revitalization approach to future development. The plan demonstrates a mid-range scenario that is consistent with past practice and City policy. Even though the focus is on the utilization of existing properties, additional growth areas are being proposed. To the south, development is shown consistent with the southern boundary of the Reynolds Ranch project. The area to the south reflects the ongoing discussions of creating a County-based plan that we refer to as the Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Area. Additional development is also shown to the west of the current General Plan boundary. These two growth areas are anchored by mixed-use centers that will contain housing, commercial, and public spaces. The southeast area of Lodi will grow east of Highway 99. This area is well-suited for business/employment expansion. Finally, we are proposing an Urban Reserve on both the west and east sides of the General Plan boundary. The west reserve is necessary in order to ensure that the City conforms to the Growth Management Ordinance which allows for two percent population growth annually. The east reserve is contemplated for industrial land uses that may take advantage of Central California Traction rail access.

At the November 12, 2008 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission had two main questions/comments that staff provided follow up information at the December 18, 2008 meeting. The questions related to the City of Stockton's General Plan and, in particular, the Agriculture/Open Space designation and the LAFCO definition of an Area of Interest.

The public comment on the Draft Preferred Plan at the initial meeting was centered on three areas: Delta College, Armstrong Road property owner interests and the Chamber of Commerce concerns.

In terms of the staff's perspective on the Delta College area, we are not proposing to designate the area within the preferred plan. We believe that it is premature to designate the College area since the most

APPROVED:

Blair King, City Manager

recent public statements contradict this from moving forward. Additionally, it is important to state that in staffs opinion, any development in that area is contingent upon a College project. We would not be discussing this as an alternative were it not for the College's previous interest. Staff is committed to providing as much flexibility in the future. As such, we are recommending that one of the Environmental Impact Report alternatives include the College site and ancillary development. This way if there is a change in the College's direction between now and the adoption of the Final General Plan, the City Council could include the area at that time.

For the Armstrong Road property owners, the Planning Commission action reflects the boundaries of the **Agriculture/Cluster** designation. This plan is to include all of the property east/west between Highway 99 and 1-5, and one-half mile north and south of Armstrong Road. The second request expressed by the Attorney representing the property owners in that area was to designate the half-mile stretch north of Armstrong Road as Planned Residential Reserve (PRR) as it is designated within the current General Plan. Staff is of the opinion that this is not consistent with the direction the City has been heading with regard to development south of Harney Lane. Further, we feel this designation contradicts the success achieved to date with regard to funding a Specific Plan. That said, it is reasonable to study the PRR designation **as** one of the alternatives for the Environmental Impact Report. This would provide the same flexibility to the City Council in the future if an issue arises during the preparation of the aforementioned Specific Plan.

The Chamber of Commerce and Mike Carouba raised concerns about the lack of industrially designated property and the growth area to the west. Staff has spent a fair amount of time looking at the industrial designation issue. We do feel there is merit to providing a specific designation as reflected in the plan proposed. The Planning Commission recommended map before you indicates this area east of Wells Avenue to the Central California Traction (CCT) line. Further, we have reviewed the property ownership pattern and parcel sizes for this area and find that they are large enough to accommodate the types of land uses that are most likely to locate in this designation. The second area of **concern** expressed by Mr. Patrick relates to the growth area to the west of the current General Plan boundary. This is shown in order to provide enough land use alternatives over the course of this 20-year plan. The Chamber has suggested that the area be designated Urban Reserve. We do not support this change. One of the intents of a General Plan is to provide direction to interested parties concerning the City's future growth. We have attempted to be practical in this approach while being cognizant of the City's existing policies. One of the implementation actions that this new General Plan will require is the designation of priority areas within the Growth Management Plan. As the Commission is aware, the process of receiving allocations occurs from a scoring of points based on a variety of subject matters. A focus of the system is the phasing of development. At this point I see the new priority areas falling into three categories: Priority Area One would include the properties that are in the existing General Plan. These areas are generally located one-half mile west of Lower Sacramento Road to the existing General Plan boundary; Priority Area Two would include the property south of Harney Lane; and Priority Area Three would include the western growth area as designated.

The final change, which occurred to the proposed plan from the first Planning Commission meeting to the December meeting, was a result of discussions with the Lodi Unified School District (LUSD). The District confirmed the need for two K-8 schools south of Harney Lane. LUSD wanted one moved to the east side of the Woodbridge Irrigation District (WID) canal. Both of these schools are planned to be on **14** acres. Another change is the school that was shown in the northwest quadrant. This school is now located closer to Kettleman Lane. The result of these changes did modify locations of certain other land uses. The final request from the School District is the designation of a new elementary (K-6) grade school on the east side of Lodi. LUSD does not have a particular site in mind; however it should be located north of Kettleman Lane and south of Lodi Avenue. We have shown a placeholder marker at the intersection of Central Avenue and Poplar Street for this purpose. This is not meant to designate a specific property, but rather to make the need clear. The ultimate location of a school will be determined by the District.

Again, staffs desire at this meeting is to open a dialogue between the Planning Commission and City Council while receiving additional public comment. Ultimately we are looking for a Plan that reflects the community's vision for the future. The City Council will be asked to provide their opinions culminating in an action that we can then use as the basis for drafting the policy document as well as the environmental impact report. The action could take place at this meeting, or should the Council desire, it could be placed on an upcoming agenda for further input.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING AVAILABLE: N/A



Konradt Bartlam
Interim Community Development Director

Attachment:

1. Draft Preferred Plan Report dated February, 2009
2. Minutes from Planning Commission Meetings 11-12-08 & 12-18-08

LODI GENERAL PLAN UPDATE



Draft Preferred Plan

City of Lodi
February 2009

PREPARED BY

DYETT & BHATIA
Urban and Regional Planners

Table of Contents

I	Introduction	I
	Purpose and Process.....	I
	Project Background.....	I
	Work Completed	I
	Public Input.....	2
	Report Organization	2
2	Preferred Plan	3
	Overall Planning Concepts	3
	Draft Land Use Classification System	4
	Citywide General Plan Land Use Framework.....	5
	Buildout	5
3	Next Steps.....	9

I Introduction

PURPOSE AND PROCESS

The Lodi Preferred Plan has been prepared to provide the basis for development of the new General Plan. Decision-maker review and endorsement of the Preferred Plan will provide direction for development of detailed proposals and policies.

In May 2008, a report on Sketch Plans—which included three land use alternatives for future development and their transportation, infrastructure, and fiscal impacts—was prepared. The alternatives presented a range of options to guide future development and intensification in Lodi, addressed goals for conservation, economic development, and walkable livable neighborhoods, and analyzed relative impacts on traffic and infrastructure.

The alternatives were reviewed in a Community Open House/Planning Commission meeting on May 10, 2008, and in numerous small-group meetings held by City staff and consultants. The Preferred Plan also builds on existing conditions, opportunities and challenges assessment, and input from the community and decision-makers through workshops, meetings, and the citywide survey.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Lodi's current General Plan was adopted in 1991. Although many of its policies are still relevant, the city has undergone changes during this period. Since 1990, the population has grown by 23 percent—from 51,900 to 63,400. Despite the recent slowdown in housing demand, growth pressures continue to be felt from within and outside the City limits. Since the adoption of the current General Plan, new ideas have emerged. For example, the City sees its future increasingly tied to the wine industry, with the surrounding vineyards providing economic sustenance and distinctive character.

The new General Plan will establish a long-range vision for the city. Policies concerning physical growth and development management; the Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Area; urban design; and growth of the wine industry and tourism, will all be addressed in the Plan. Eight chapters or elements will likely comprise the new General Plan: Land Use, Growth Management, Community Design and Livability, Circulation, Parks/Recreation, Conservation, Noise, and Safety. Sustainability policies will be incorporated throughout the General Plan. The Housing Element was prepared in 2004 and is being updated separately from this effort.

WORK COMPLETED

As part of the General Plan Update process, four working papers documenting existing conditions, trends, planning issues, and implications have been prepared, as well as a report on Sketch Plans:

- Working Paper #1: Land Use, Transportation, Environment, and Infrastructure;
- Working Paper #2: Urban Design and Livability;
- Working Paper #3: Growth and Economic Development Strategy;

- Working Paper #4: Greenbelt Conservation Strategies; and
- Sketch Plan Report, which presented alternative land use scenarios for development.

PUBLIC INPUT

Public participation lies at the heart of the Lodi General Plan Update. Community members and stakeholders are being asked for ideas and input through:

- Public workshops and meetings;
- Workshops with the City Council and Planning Commission;
- Stakeholder interviews and neighborhood meetings;
- Presentations to service clubs and neighborhood groups;
- Newsletters;
- A mail-in survey sent to all residential addresses in the city;
- Comments via e-mail; and
- A project website (www.lodi.gov/community_development/general_plan).

Reports on stakeholder meetings, the citywide survey, and community and decision-maker meetings are available on the project website. Together, the community and decision-makers will provide direction toward the next step in the process: the General Plan Update.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

Following this introduction, the report presents the Preferred Plan in Chapter 2, which describes overall planning concepts, the land use diagram and classification, potential buildout in 2030. Next steps are described in Chapter 3.

2 Preferred Plan

OVERALL PLANNING CONCEPTS

The Preferred Plan is illustrated in Figure 2-1 (Concept Plan) and Figure 2-2 (Draft Preferred Plan). The Plan depicts ten central concepts, highlighted during the visioning phase and developed through discussions with stakeholders and community members:

1. **Compact Urban Form.** The Preferred Plan maintains and enhances Lodi's compact urban form, promoting infill development Downtown and along key corridors, while also outlining growth possibilities directly adjacent to the existing urban edge. The City's overall form will be squarish, reinforcing Downtown as the heart of the community, with virtually all new development located within three miles from it.
2. **Preservation of Existing Neighborhoods.** Existing development in a vast majority of the Planning Area is proposed to remain as is, in terms of land use and density. Lodi residents are proud of their existing vibrant neighborhoods. They enjoy the small-town character of the city and would like to ensure that Lodi's high quality-of-life is enhanced as the city grows.
3. **Study Area Along Southern Boundary.** In order to preserve agriculture and maintain a clear distinction between Lodi and Stockton, the Plan acknowledges the Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Area along the south edge of Lodi, from I-5 to just east of SR-99, and south to Stockton's Planning Area boundary.
4. **Enhanced Mixed-Use Centers.** The Plan shows a Mixed-Use overlay Downtown and along the city's major commercial corridors. This delineation permits continued investment in these areas and enhancement through the development of vacant and underutilized parcels. The Plan also describes new neighborhoods organized around mixed-use centers, which provide retail services and office development, as well as housing.
5. **Employment-Focused Development in the Southeast.** The area east of SR-99 toward the south is shown as a growth area for office/business park uses and some commercial use. This area has excellent regional access, and is adjacent to existing urbanized areas.
6. **Street Connectivity and Urban Design.** A theme that emerged from community dialogue in the early stages of the planning process is the desire to see greater connections, mixing of uses, and diversity of building types in new neighborhoods. The updated General Plan will include a more complete discussion and plan for improving street connectivity, particularly in terms of access to Downtown, neighborhoods, jobs, and shopping.
7. **Enhanced Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections.** Lodi already has an expansive bicycle network and good pedestrian facilities, including sidewalks, signals, landscaping and street furniture—particularly Downtown. Improvements to pedestrian and bicycle pathways in new and existing neighborhoods will be identified in the General Plan Update.
8. **Recreation Path along Irrigation Canal Right-of-Way.** The Woodbridge Irrigation District (WID) Canal runs through the city, passing through residential neighborhoods. A public recreation trail is envisioned in the Preferred Plan, creating an amenity for walking, jogging and biking.

9. **Phasing Future Development.** The Plan identifies urban reserve area along the west and east edges of the city to provide additional area for development, if needed. These urban reserve areas ensure that the city conforms to its Growth Management Ordinance and grows at a reasonable rate.
10. **Mokelumne River as the City's Northern Edge.** The Lodi community has expressed a desire to see the river remain as the City's northern edge. The southern bank of the river (within the City) is occupied by residential uses and streets do not reach the river. Therefore, connectivity across the river to knit the urban fabric would be challenging if growth were to extend northward.

DRAFT LAND USE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

The classifications in this section will represent adopted policy, once finalized and approved. They are meant to be broad enough to provide flexibility in implementation, but clear enough to provide sufficient direction to carry out the General Plan. These definitions may be elaborated upon as the General Plan is developed.

Residential

- **Low-Density Residential:** Detached single-family dwellings ranging from two to eight units per acre. An average density of 6.5 units per acre is assumed for buildout projections.
- **Medium-Density Residential:** Detached or attached (townhomes) single-family, duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes, ranging from eight to 20 units per acre. An average density of 12 units per acre is assumed for buildout projections.
- **High-Density Residential:** Townhomes and stacked multifamily housing ranging from 15 to 35 units per acre. An average density of 22 units per acre is assumed for buildout projections.

Commercial, Office, and Industrial

- **General Commercial:** Retail uses, including citywide shopping centers with off-street parking and neighborhood shopping with clusters of street-front stores; also includes hotels. An average Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.3 is assumed for buildout projections.
- **Business Park/Office:** Clusters of office activities that generate high employment yield per acre and smaller-scale professional, medical, and other support services. An average FAR of 0.35 is assumed for buildout projections.
- **Industrial:** Mix of manufacturing, production, warehousing, general service, storage, and distribution activities. An average FAR of 0.3 is assumed for buildout projections.

Mixed-Use

- **Downtown Mixed Use:** Variety of commercial and office uses, and medium- and high-density residential development and mixed-use development on infill sites. An average FAR of 1.0 is assumed for buildout projections.
- **Mixed Use Corridor:** Variety of low-, medium-, and high-density residential, office and general commercial uses, along the city's major corridors. An average FAR of 0.45 is assumed for buildout projections.

- **Mixed Use Center:** New mixed-use neighborhood centers; variety of medium- and high-density residential, office and neighborhood commercial uses. An average FAR of 0.5 is assumed for buildout projections.

Public and Open Space

- **Public/Quasi-Public:** Government facilities, public and private schools, and libraries.
- **Parks/Open Space:** Parks, recreation complexes, trails, and drainage basins.

CITYWIDE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE FRAMEWORK

Integrating the Preferred Plan concepts and planning areas with existing development in the city results in a compact and coherent land use framework, as shown in Figure 2-3. This draft land use framework will inform the land use diagram in the General Plan Update. The framework highlights a mixed-use Downtown, major commercial and mixed-use corridors, and office and industrial development east of SR-99. Residential development continues to comprise the majority of the city, with a range of densities. Most residential development continues to be low-density single-family attached and detached homes, although medium- and some high-density housing is planned for highly accessible areas—near transit, commercial corridors, and Downtown, and in and near mixed-use centers. Parks, schools, and other public facilities are dispersed throughout the city to ensure a high level of accessibility to public services.

BUILDOUT

Full development potential is referred to as “buildout.” It is calculated based on the assumptions of new housing and new commercial and residential development that could be built under the Preferred Plan. The buildout gives a theoretical indication of potential population and employment trends and allows the City to plan for growth accordingly.

Residential

Based on average buildout densities (described in the classification section above), the Preferred Plan accommodates approximately 6,300 housing units, as shown in Table 2-1. Low-density or single-family detached units would be the most prevalent housing type with 49 percent of the total. Units that are part of medium-density units constitute 25 percent of housing development, in the Preferred Plan; mixed-use developments represent 21 percent; and high-density units represent five percent.

The Urban Reserve area along the western side of the city accommodates an additional 3,900 housing units, allowing up to 10,200 new units by 2030. In sum, existing housing units, approved development projects, and the Preferred Plan would result in more than 37,000 housing units by 2030 (see Chart 2-1).

Table 2-1: Preferred Plan Housing Units, by Density and Type

<i>Residential Density/Type</i>	<i>Number of Housing Units¹</i>	<i>Percent Share</i>
Low-Density	3,100	49%
Medium-Density	1,600	25%
High-Density	300	5%
Mixed-Use	1,300	21%
Subtotal Preferred Plan	6,300	100%
Urban Reserve	3,900	
Total Preferred Plan	10,200	

¹. Number of housing units is rounded to the nearest hundred.

Source: City of Lodi, 2008, California Department of Finance 2008, Dyett & Bhatia, 2008.

Population

The Preferred Plan would add 16,100 new residents to Lodi by 2030. Accounting for the current population as well as new residents anticipated from recently approved projects, the population at buildout could result in nearly 90,000 residents, representing an annual growth rate of 1.5 percent (see Table 2-2). Since the City's Growth Management Ordinance allows for annual growth up to two percent, the Preferred Plan proposes an urban reserve area that delineates appropriate areas for further growth, up to the two percent threshold. If the market could bear this growth rate, the population could increase to nearly 99,500 at buildout in 2030 (Total, with Urban Reserve).

Table 2-2: Summary of Projected Population at Buildout

<i>Population Type</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Annual Growth Rate</i>
Preferred Plan ^{1,2}	16,100	
Recently Approved Projects	9,865	
Existing (2008)	63,362	
Subtotal Preferred Plan	89,327	1.5%
Urban Reserve	10,100	
Total Preferred Plan	99,427	2.0%

¹. Preferred Plan population rounded to the nearest hundred.

². Population assumed average household size of 2.75.

Source: City of Lodi, 2008, California Department of Finance 2008, Dyett & Bhatia, 2008.

Non-Residential

Table 2-3 summarizes net new development, by land use. Business Park/Office and Industrial represent the largest non-residential land use, with proposed development concentrated on the eastern portion of the city. Areas identified for mixed-use development on the Preferred Plan map are broken down and reflected in the General Commercial, Neighborhood Commercial and Business Park/Office designations in the table below. Parks and detention basins total 130 acres under the Preferred Plan, resulting in a combined ratio of eight acres of open space per

1,000 new residents. This ratio is consistent with the standard set in the 1991 General Plan and the 1994 Parks Master Plan. Acreage for Public/Schools totals to 37 acres, allowing for three schools serving Kindergarten through eighth grade and other public facilities. A placeholder for an additional school site is shown near Central Avenue and East Poplar Street, but is not reflected in the buildout acreage.

Table 2-3: Preferred Plan Buildout, by Non-Residential Land Use

<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Buildout¹</i>
General Commercial (SF)	3,323,000
Neighborhood Commercial (SF)	201,000
Business Park/Office (SF)	5,170,000
Industrial (SF)	5,120,000
Park/Detention Basin (Acres)	130
Public/Schools (Acres)	37

¹. Buildout square footages are rounded to the nearest thousand.

Source: Dyett & Bhatia, 2008.

Employment

The total additional employment accommodated in the Preferred Plan by new commercial, office, and industrial land designations would allow for 33,800 new jobs in Lodi, as shown in Table 2-4. Development within the Urban Reserve would create another 6,100 jobs. Additional jobs would be created by new schools, public facilities, and construction needs. Recently approved or “pipeline” projects (such as the Blue Shield call center and retail sector jobs as part of the Reynolds Ranch development) are expected to produce an additional 3,000 jobs. In sum, Lodi could expect over 70,000 jobs by 2030 (see Chart 2-1).

Table 2-4: Preferred Plan Jobs, by Sector

<i>Sector</i>	<i>Number of Jobs¹</i>
Commercial	10,100
Office	15,900
Industrial	7,800
Subtotal Preferred Plan	33,800
Urban Reserve	6,100
Total Preferred Plan	39,900


¹. Number of jobs rounded to the nearest hundred.

Source: City of Lodi, 2008, California Department of Finance 2008, Dyett & Bhatia, 2008.

In 2000, Lodi had a jobs/employed residents ratio of 0.89, meaning that the city did not have quite enough jobs for all the working people who lived there, even if the match between job skills required and job skills offered had been perfect. The Preferred Plan provides opportunity

for substantial employment growth should opportunities exist, resulting in a jobs/employed residents' ratio of 1.3 in 2030, both with and without the Urban Reserve.¹

Chart 2-1: Population, Housing Units, and Employment at Buildout



Source: City of Lodi, California Department of Finance, Dyett & Bhatia, 2008; California Employment Development Department, 2006.

¹ The jobs/employed residents ratio for 2030 uses the same proportion of employed residents in the total population from 2000 (57 percent) to estimate the potential workforce.


3 Next Steps

The Planning Commission and the City Council will review and endorse the Preferred Plan. The Plan will then be used as the basis for crafting detailed General Plan policies. An Environmental Impact Report on the Plan will also be prepared. The Draft General Plan and the Draft EIR will be subject to community review and public hearings by the Planning Commission and the City Council prior to adoption.

Figure 2-1 Concept Plan

New neighborhood centers are located near major corridors, creating connections to Downtown and existing neighborhoods. These mixed-use centers will contain housing, parks, schools, shops, and other public services.

The city's thriving Downtown will be enhanced through redevelopment of vacant and underutilized sites and complemented by the intensification of mixed-use corridors along some of the city's major streets.



The Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Area delineates the boundary between urban development in Lodi and the border of Stockton, just to the south.

Residents will enjoy easy access to neighborhood and commercial centers, shown here as 1/4-mile radius walking distances.

Business park, office, and commercial development capitalize on convenient highway and thoroughfare access.

Figure 2-2:
Draft Preferred Plan





Figure 2-3
General Plan Land Use



**LODI PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING
CARNEGIE FORUM, 305 WEST PINE STREET
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2008**

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The Regular Planning Commission meeting of November 12, 2008, was called to order by Chair Kiser at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Planning Commissioners – Cummins, Heinitz, Hennecke, Kirsten, Mattheis, Olson, and Chair Kiser

Absent: Planning Commissioners – None

Also Present: Interim Community Development Director Konradt Bartlam, Deputy City Attorney Janice Magdich, Consultant Rajeev Bhatia, and Administrative Secretary Kari Chadwick

2. MINUTES

“October 8, 2008”

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Vice Chair Cummins, Heinitz second, approved the Minutes of October 8, 2008 as written.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a) Notice thereof having been published according to law, an affidavit of which publication is on file in the Community Development Department, Chair Kiser called for the public hearing to consider and recommend to the City Council the Draft Preferred Plan Alternative and report for the General Plan Update.

Interim Director Konradt Bartlam gave a brief introduction for the project and then introduced Rajeev Bhatia from the consulting firm Dyett and Bhatia to give the presentation.

Rajeev Bhatia gave a brief PowerPoint presentation based on the Lodi General Plan Update (GPU), Draft Preferred Plan (DPP) report. Mr. Bhatia stated that once the DPP has been solidified then the work on the other elements that will go into the GPU can be started. The DPP is keeping the compact shape that Lodi currently has. There has been some community center areas incorporated into the plan with residential within a half mile radius, promoting walk-ability. There will be policies within the General Plan to avoid development jumping into the Urban Reserve areas creating pockets of development. The population for this plan is estimated to be at 89,800 and if the entire Urban Reserve area is developed it will be approximately 99,900. The City currently has 27,500 jobs and this plan allows for 72,000 plus another 6,000 in the Urban Reserve area. This would make the job/house ratio for the City about 1.4:1, that ratio is currently 0.88:1.

Commissioner Olson asked if an economic analysis was done concurrently with this report. Mr. Bhatia stated that many aspects of the City's elements were looked at and analyzed. Once the Preferred Plan is chosen there will be another analysis done to be more specific to that plan. Olson asked if the industrial areas were left out due to some of the information gathered. Mr. Bartlam stated that the term Business Park is being used as an all encompassing term for Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial, and Office use. Olson stated that it would be a shame to not give companies that are currently here that would like to grow no place to go. Mr. Bartlam stated that there will be some specific planning done from a Utility Master Plan bases. The plan generates a direction and then policies will generate a direction for the Utility Master Plan. Olson asked about the job balancing ratio. Mr. Bhatia stated that typically there are 1.2 jobs needed per household and when that is in perfect balance with the jobs offered you will have the same number on both sides. Mr. Bartlam

stated that just because it is being shown on the map doesn't mean it will happen. The notion of full build-out is basically a theoretical idea. The plan allows for the best case ideals.

Commissioner Heinritz asked if it wouldn't be prudent to include the Delta College site in the plan. Mr. Bartlam stated that once staff understood that the project was not moving forward then the area was removed from the plan, but just because it is shown or not shown in the plan doesn't mean it will or won't happen. Commissioner Heinritz stated that the General Plan can be amended. Mr. Bartlam stated that is correct, four times a year.

Vice Chair Cummins asked for the definition of Urban Reserve. Mr. Bhatia stated that the Urban Reserve area is used when and if all the urban areas have been developed. Cummins asked about the Mixed Use Centers specifically the area along HWY 12 as you enter the City from the west. Mr. Bhatia stated that the intention there is to have not only commercial uses, but also office and hotels. Mr. Bartlam stated that the mixed use could be horizontal and/or vertical. The center is meant to identify areas. Cummins asked if this is economically viable. Mr. Bartlam stated that yes it can work, for instance; Salisbury Market with Wine and Roses at the corner of Turner Road and Lower Sacramento Road. Cummins asked about the walking path along the irrigation canal. Mr. Bartlam stated that the first time this idea was presented years ago it was not very popular with the residences in the area, but he feels that it is worth looking at it again.

Commissioner Hennecke asked about the area south of the city being designated a Study Area. Mr. Bartlam stated that it is being called a study area because that is exactly what it is. There is an item going before Council that could potentially put the area ½ mile north and south of Armstrong from Hwy 99 to I-5 into a study area and hopefully by the time the General Plan is near completion that study will be further along. Hennecke asked if the area could be considered an Area of Interest and placed in the General Plan. Mr. Bartlam stated that it can be, but it still isn't something that LAFCO has embraced. Hennecke asked about the area to the north and why there isn't any growth being shown there. Mr. Bhatia stated that developing on both sides of the river has a lot of challenges and will be a tough area to develop. Hennecke stated that this could be an area that we could try to lock up in an Area of Interest. Mr. Bartlam stated that the County is also going through their General Plan Update and this is a good time to give them our input for future uses.

Commissioner Mattheis asked if the policies will outline the use of the Urban Reserve areas; east vs west. Mr. Bartlam stated that yes there will be policies that outline the eastern area and a separate policy for the western area. Mattheis asked why leave the urban reserve area uses blank if the City is concerned with providing for the connectivity. Mr. Bartlam stated that by designating land uses within the urban reserve areas gives the wrong impression of growth. The Growth Management policies have priority areas and that would be used to grow into the urban reserve area. Mattheis wanted to clarify if when the City opens up the Urban Reserve areas for development it will create a trigger to open discussions up to the public again. Mr. Bartlam stated that is correct. Mattheis asked what the benefit is to putting the Study Area to the south into the General Plan. Mr. Bartlam stated that by giving the area a designation puts a stamp on it. Mattheis asked about city services going into the area. Mr. Bartlam stated that from a staff perspective it is possible, but there are a lot of players involved. Mattheis asked if services are being contemplated for the area why not bring it into the Sphere of Influence. Mr. Bartlam stated that there is a planning process in the works by the County that is outside the County's General Plan and will be an independent document specific for that area. Mattheis asked about the medium density residential on the eastside and how it effects the density in the area. Mr. Bhatia stated that this could potentially increase the density for the area. Mr. Bartlam stated that implementation of the policies are going to be the heart of the plan. Mattheis asked about the transition from mixed use centers to residential areas and creating more of a step down effect. Mr. Bhatia stated that the intention is to have a step down from the center, commercial/office uses to the residential areas and that will be describe more clearly in the policies. Mattheis asked about the over building of more retail/industrial and how people commuting into the area to work effects the global warming issue and the problem that could be faced with CEQA. Mr. Bhatia stated that will be a consideration when creating the environmental document. Mattheis stated that he thinks that the City may be over reaching a bit in this area. Mr. Bartlam stated that the environmental document will need to address these issues.

Commissioner Kirsten asked if the designation Ag/Open Space placed in Stockton's General Plan is a valid designation in LAFCO's eyes. Mr. Bartlam stated that he is familiar with the designation, but not familiar with Stockton's General Plan Policies that implement that designation. Kirsten stated that he would be interested in knowing the definition and whether or not the designation is binding. Mr. Bartlam stated that he would hesitate to recommend an area as Open Space. He stated that there are several property owners in the Armstrong area that would not appreciate an Open Space designation without some concessions. Kirsten asked if the Delta College development comes back to the table what about the leap frog policy that will be preventing that development. Mr. Bhatia stated that there can be language added to allow or not allow this type of development. Kirsten asked about the passive park area in regards to the proposed Delta College Site. Mr. Bartlam stated that the language can be written either way. Worst case scenario full blown land use that takes a look at the leap frog aspect and best case scenario decisions are made to accommodate this project within this General Plan. Mr. Bhatia stated that language should be added to plan for not only the college but for the surrounding areas also.

Chair Kiser asked if the area could be put into the Urban Reserve designation. Mr. Bhatia stated that the Urban Reserve area is meant to be contiguous with the area around it. Putting the Delta College campus out on Hwy 12 creates a totally different infrastructure for the area. Mr. Bartlam stated that the decision that staff made to leave it out was based on the decision made by the College Board. The only interest that the City had in that area was the College. Kiser asked to have the difference between a Sphere of Influence and Urban Reserve explained. Mr. Bartlam stated that a Sphere of Influence is an area that the City wishes to designate for future growth and LAFCO must concur. The Urban Reserve is similar, but does not require LAFCO to agree. The reserve states that the City has a desire and interest if the need arises to grow in that area.

Commissioner Hennecke asked if the terminology that the city uses should match LAFCO's. Mr. Bartlam stated that the definitions are different. What the city wants to designate as Urban Reserve will not have the same definition and implementation policies as the Area of Interest that LAFCO uses. Hennecke stated that LAFCO has hinted at the idea that if one entity designating an Area of Interest it would preclude another party from taking possession. Mr. Bartlam stated that he does not have the level of detail about the intent of that definition, but it is a LAFCO definition not a universal definition like Sphere of Influence. Hennecke asked about the Sphere of Influence encompassing Woodbridge. Mr. Bartlam stated there is no intention of annexing land from Woodbridge, but has been a part of the Sphere of Influence since before the current General Plan. As an example, Woodbridge School could not have been annexed if the area had not been in the Sphere, but there is not any intention of annexing any more land in the Woodbridge area. Hennecke stated that the Mountain House Delta College project has not been done well and would not like to see that happen to Lodi.

Vice Chair Cummins asked if the area on Cochran Road has been annexed into the City. Mr. Bartlam stated that Cochran Road is completely a part of the City. There is an area west of Lower Sacramento Road along Taylor Road that has not been annexed. Cummins stated that that is the area he meant and asked if that area is planned to be annexed. Mr. Bartlam stated that yes it is a part of the current General Plan as Planned Residential, but the area getting annexed is in the hands of the property owners.

Chair Kiser called for a five minute recess (8:29)

Chair Kiser called the meeting back to order (8:39)

Hearing Opened to the Public

- Patrick McCuen, developer working on the Delta College Lodi site, came forward to support the addition of the site into the General Plan. Mr. McCuen stated that there is reason to believe that the new board for the College is in favor of pursuing this growth site. He handed in a letter (attached) for the Commission to consider.

- Commissioner Kirsten ask if there is a designation placed in the General Plan for the College what is the likelihood that the College would be inclined to go forward. Mr. McCuen stated that the college got frustrated with the General Plan Amendment process. They would be more inclined to focus on an area that is already designated for them. Kirsten asked if the City were to designate this area for the College would it encourage the Board to move forward with the project. Mr. McCuen stated that it would be considered a generous invitation and would be well received.
- Commissioner Mattheis asked about the land uses used in the sketch plan (attached). Mr. McCuen stated that the colors represent the designations from sketch plan C. Mattheis asked if there would be any reservations of designating the area a mixed use center. Mr. McCuen stated that there would not be any reservations to that suggestion.
- Pat Patrick, Chamber of Commerce, came forward to encourage the Commission to not send the plan on to the City Council with a recommendation. Mr. Patrick stated his reservation of how the designations are defined and how the areas are presented. He would like to see a plan that is geared more toward the encouragement of the wine industry. He agrees with Commissioner Hennecke in regards to the terminology used by the City and how it relates to LAFCO's terminology. What is the likelihood of Lodi growing out to the full growth area as presented in this plan? Mr. Patrick does not think it is likely to happen. The first time that the path along the Woodbridge Irrigation Canal was brought forward the homeowners whose backyards abut it were strongly against the idea and Mr. Patrick does not think that sentiment has changed. He would like to see more consistency with the designations in the plan.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked for clarification on the area in the SE corner of the plan. What would the Chamber like to see for that area? Mr. Patrick stated that the Chamber would like to see the area on the west side of the CCT line be designated as industrial. Kirsten asked if the market recovered and there was a drive to use the land as designated on this plan would the Chamber support that growth. Mr. Patrick stated that the Chamber would support it if it was being market driven, but the odds of that happening based on past experiences in Lodi isn't good.
- Commissioner Hennecke asked if the industrial area along the traction line were to be placed in the plan as the Chamber is suggesting then wouldn't that drive the residential to the west. Mr. Patrick stated that that is only one ingredient in the mix. The City has been operating on little, if no, available industrial property for the last couple of years. Hennecke asked if the chamber has looked at the area north of the Mockelumne River and the Goehring Meat property. Mr. Patrick stated that they have talked with Delta College and Blue Shield, but the infrastructure is difficult and the history of the property is a bit tainted.
- Mike Carouba, Lodi, came forward to present the ideas that the Chamber has come up with. Mr. Carouba handed the Commission a land use map that express the ideas of the Chamber (attached). The Chamber is not recommending the urban growth to the west because of the areas that are already in the process and will probably extend out the growth to the 20 years considering the slow start that the economy is giving us. The Chamber's White papers suggested that there be a new land use that would encourage high density commercial/industrial job sites and in response city staff came up with the Business Park/Office which combines this new land use idea with the M-1 & M-2 designations. This isn't exactly what the Chamber wanted. The Chamber wants a new designation over and above the M-1 & M-2, not a combination of all three into one. New Urbanism is a new concept and the growth of the city should reflect this new concept; for instance the Downtown Mixed Use and the Mixed Use Corridor areas are definitely worth a try; however the Mixed Use Centers placed in the growth areas are not economically viable. Mr. Carouba continued with his comments using the two, Chamber's & Draft Preferred Plan, land use maps to point out the positives and negatives of the Preferred Plan.
- Commissioner Hennecke asked about the proposed development for Delta College. Mr. Carouba stated that the Chamber was not aware of the new interest and the site was not able to be included in the Chamber's plan, but the Chamber is in full support of the idea.

- Commissioner Olson asked about the removal of the Medium Density area to the south in the Chamber's plan. Mr. Carouba stated that there was no intention of removing any of the Medium Density areas to the south; only the Mixed Use Centers.
- Chair Kiser asked about the types of industrial users that the Chamber sees in the area adjacent to the traction line. Mr. Carouba stated that food processors, distribution centers and heavy industrial type businesses that have the need for rail uses.
- Steve Herum, Herum & Crabtree, Attorney representing the Armstrong property owners south of the City and the Fry, Fink and Costa families, came forward to express their concerns. The property owners in the Harney Lane and Armstrong area are afraid that the hard work that they put in 20 years ago to get the PRR designation in the 1991 General Plan will all go to waste. They don't want to come away with less than they currently have. The failure to put a definition to the designation for the area south of Lodi is troubling. The Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Area designation is new to the plan and people have not had enough time to digest it. What happens if the County does not adopt the designation that the City is proposing? Mr. Herum would like to see a time out taken to provide more meat to the bones and see of the policies for the more unique designation in more detail. He handed the Commission a copy of the current General Plan with the PRR area south of the City outlined and a sample definition for the new Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Area (both attached). The Stockton General Plan had several of the mix use centers in their plan and the same arguments that are being heard here were heard there.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked about the Ag/Open Space designation that is in the Stockton General Plan. Mr. Herum stated that the focus should be more toward the Sphere of Influence area which is where the growth will be. Kirsten asked again if the Ag/Open Space is a binding designation. Mr. Herum stated that like any General Plan designation it can be changed. The area north with the Ag/Open Space designation was done with that property owner's consent.
- Commissioner Hennecke asked about Mr. Herum's take on LAFCO's Area of Interest designation. Mr. Herum stated that that is all it is, a statement that shows interest.
- Pat Stocker came forward to comment on the plan. He stated his objection of this map moving forward to the City Council based on the comments heard here tonight. The area that he would like to focus on is the buffer area. Mr. Stocker stated that he prefers the term Study Area for the south side, because that is what it should be considered. Going east of Hwy 99 was not in the original plan for the Study Area nor is it in the County's RFP. He feels it is premature to include the commercial area that is on the south east corner of Hwy 99 and Harney Lane. Mr. Stocker would like to see the City take an interest in the area north of the Mokelumne River. The same idea for the southern edge of the city should be put toward the northern edge. He would like to see the Urban Reserve area to the east moved back to the southern edge of the city because he does not feel that this area would be conducive for residential. Mr. Stocker would like to have a little more time to process this before it is sent on to the City Council.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked Mr. Stocker to point out the area of his property east of Hwy 99 that is zoned AL5 along Hogan Lane. Mr. Stocker with the use of a laser pointer complied. The property has been zoned AL5 since the 1990 when the County's General Plan was adopted.
- Bruce Fry, Lodi, came forward to encourage the Commission not to pass this plan on to the City Council until people have a chance to digest the new designations that have been added. Mr. Fry stated that he agrees with the comments that have been made so far. He would have liked to have seen the current General Plan map made available for comparison purposes when the alternative plans were being discussed.
- Jim Migliori, Petrovich Development, came forward to support the area designation in the SE corner of Harney Lane and Hwy 99 which he has an interest in.

- Anne Cerney came forward to make comments. Ms. Cerney stated that she lives in Lodi and will not benefit from the growth of Lodi. The comments that have been made here tonight have been very one sided and they have been made by people that will benefit by the growth of Lodi. There is going to be an item going before the City Council in the near future that consists of the County asking for money to fund an environmental document that will effect the Ag designation south of the City of Lodi which will in turn benefit some of the people that have spoken here tonight. Ms. Cerney stated that elections have consequences referring to the City of Stockton's Council election and the effect it will have on the concept of the greenbelt between our two Cities.

Public Portion of Hearing Closed

Chair Kiser called for a five minute break (10:14).

Chair Kiser called the meeting back to order (10:18)

- Commissioner Heinitz asked what the procedure should be from here regarding more time. Mr. Bartlam stated that it is up to the Commission at this point. Commissioner Heinitz would like to see more time for the public to digest this plan and consider the Delta College site.
- Commissioner Olson stated that she would like to see the Industrial area placed alongside the traction line vs the Business Park/Office.
- Commissioner Kirsten agreed with Commissioner Olson regarding the area along the traction line. Kirsten stated that there are four new people on the Delta College Board and would like to see if there really is any interest in the Lodi site. He would like to see the site placed back on the map if there is interest.
- Commissioner Hennecke stated that he would also be in favor of placing the Delta College site back on the map if there could be some kind of confirmation directly from the College Board. He would like to see the Industrial designation used along the traction line. He would also like to get in alignment with LAFCO in regards to the designations.
- Commissioner Mattheis stated support for the plan. He would like to see encouragement for infill projects. He likes the mixed use centers and is looking forward to seeing the policies that will go along with those designations. He feels the Urban Reserve areas are responsible planning and would like to see them stay in the plan. Mattheis agrees with the other Commissioners in regards to the corridor along the traction line, but from what staff has stated the Business Park/Office designation will allow for that flexibility. He would like to see a detailed market analysis regarding the large chunk of Commercial on the SE corner of Hwy 99 and Kettleman Lane. The AL5 designation, what happens if that designation goes away? Mr. Bartlam stated that he will address that at the next meeting. Mattheis is not in favor of adding the Delta College site with just the hope that they will come and fill it. The main concern is that once there is residential designated for that area there could be a push to grow east with more residential when the time comes for the next General Plan. Mattheis suggested putting the area for the college into a Urban Reserve designation.
- Vice Chair Cummins would like to see the new plan put into the news paper and placed on the City's website to help encourage more comments.

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Commissioner Heinitz, Cummins second, tabled the request of the Planning Commission to consider and recommend to the City Council the Draft Preferred Plan Alternative and report for the General Plan Update.

Continued

Ayes: Commissioners – Cummins, Heinitz, Hennecke, Kirsten, Olson, Mattheis, and
Chair Kiser

Noes: Commissioners – None

4. PLANNING MATTERS/FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

None

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

None

6. ACTIONS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Summary Memo Attached

7. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE/DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE

Mr. Bartlam brought up some calendar items that are ready to be brought before the Commission before the end of the year and with the City Council using the December 10th meeting to hear the Lodi Shopping Center Appeals. December 18th was discussed as a possible special meeting for the Commission.

8. ACTIONS OF THE SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

None

9. ART IN PUBLIC PLACES

Commissioner Kirsten stated that there was a meeting, but because to the late hour will bring everyone up to date at the next meeting.

10. COMMENTS BY THE PUBLIC

None

11. COMMENTS BY STAFF AND COMMISSIONERS

None

12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

ATTEST:

Konradt Bartlam
Interim Community Development Director

**LODI PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING
CARNEGIE FORUM, 305 WEST PINE STREET
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2008**

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The Regular Planning Commission meeting of December 18, 2008, was called to order by Chair Kiser at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Planning Commissioners – Cummins, Hennecke, Kirsten, Mattheis, Olson, and Chair Kiser

Absent: Planning Commissioners – Heinitz

Also Present: Interim Community Development Director Konradt Bartlam, Assistant Planner Immanuel Bereket, Deputy City Attorney Janice Magdich, Consultant Rajeev Bhatia, and Administrative Secretary Kari Chadwick

2. MINUTES

“November 12, 2008”

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Commissioner Kirsten, Cummins second, approved the Minutes of November 12, 2008 as written.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a) Notice thereof having been published according to law, an affidavit of which publication is on file in the Community Development Department, Chair Kiser called for the public hearing to consider request for Certification of the proposed Negative Declaration as an adequate environmental documentation for the proposed Tentative Parcel Map; and

Request for approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to divide Two Parcels into Seven Lots at 1235 E. Kettleman Lane and 1150 Beckman Road. (Applicant: Geweke Construction & Development, File #'s: 08-ND-03 & 08-P-06).

Assistant Planner Immanuel Bereket gave a brief PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report. Mr. Bereket went through the amendments in the resolution for this project as shown on the Blue Sheeted version presented to the Commission.

Hearing Opened to the Public

- John Farris, Geweke Construction, came forward to answer questions.

Public Portion of Hearing Closed

- Commissioner Kirsten stated his support of the project.
- Chair Kiser stated his support for the project.

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Commissioner Olson, Kirsten second, approved the request for Certification of the proposed Negative Declaration as adequate environmental documentation for the proposed Tentative Parcel Map subject to the conditions in the Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners – Cummins, Hennecke, Kirsten, Olson, Mattheis, and Chair Kiser
Noes: Commissioners – None
Absent: Commissioners – Heinitz

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Commissioner Hennecke, Olson second, approved the request for approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to divide Two Parcels into Seven Lots at 1235 E. Kettleman Lane and 1150 Beckman Road subject to the conditions in the Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners – Cummins, Hennecke, Kirsten, Olson, Mattheis, and Chair Kiser
Noes: Commissioners – None
Absent: Commissioners – Heinitz

- b) Notice thereof having been published according to law, an affidavit of which publication is on file in the Community Development Department, Chair Kiser called for the public hearing to consider and recommend to the City Council the Draft Preferred Plan Alternative and report for the General Plan Update.

Interim Director Konradt Bartlam gave a brief presentation based on the staff report, which included a summary of the changes made to the plan based on comments made at the last meeting. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the Draft Preferred Plan that is being presented tonight. The Plan puts emphasis on infill growth with the Mixed Use Corridor areas. It is important for the plan to be in line with the City's policies. The City is split into three priority areas for the Growth Management Process; area one being worth the most points and area three being worth the least. This was done to control the way the City should grow and it has worked very well. Staff will be recommending that this policy stay in place with the area west of Lower Sacramento Road being a priority area one, the area south of Harney Lane being priority area two and the area west of the existing city boundary be priority area three. Since the last meeting the Lodi Unified School District has fine tuned their needs for school areas which are reflected in this new plan.

Commissioner Hennecke asked about the Urban Reserve area on the east side of the City being part of the 2% growth calculation. Mr. Bartlam stated that it is not part of that 2% because it is intended to be used as Industrial reserve, not residential. Hennecke asked why it is necessary to designate reserve areas at all. Mr. Bartlam stated that there are several reasons for the designation. One of which is to avoid a costly revision to the General Plan at a later date and another is to meet State requirements for housing for this area which is the purpose of the west reserve area. The State frowns on the City's Growth Management Program because of the limited growth potential it provides.

Commissioner Mattheis asked about the deletion or shifting of the high density area that was in the western growth area. Mr. Bartlam stated that when the school site was moved further south it made sense to add a basin/park area adjacent to it shrinking the very large park area at the north end of the area. Mattheis asked about the shrinking of the Mixed Use area in the southern part of the plan. Mr. Bartlam stated that staff went back and took a closer look at the scale of the area and found that this ten acre area is sufficient. Staff feels that it is still enough to create an anchor for the neighborhood. Mr. Bhatia added that the mixed use areas will be encouraging high density residential. Mattheis stated his preference for the position of the Mixed Use Center in the southern area and wanted to know why it wasn't placed in a more central location to be in a position to accommodate the Urban Reserve to the west. Mr. Bartlam stated that the positioning of the designation on Mills Avenue made the most sense and when the School District moved the school site the designation was moved to the opposite side of Mills to accommodate the change. Mattheis asked about the High Density area near the Downtown. Mr. Bartlam stated that that area has remained the same from the previous plan, but is intended to reflect what is currently there and provide some flexibility for re-use.

Commissioner Mattheis disclosed that he met with representatives from Capital Avenue Development regarding the plans for the Delta College site.

Commissioner Mattheis asked about the Delta College site and shouldn't there be some discussion on what the Land Uses will be if it is going to be included in some of the alternatives late on. Mr. Bartlam stated that there are a couple of different options that can be taken regarding this site. One is to include it and the detailed Land Uses in the Plan and another is to include the area in the plan as an Urban Reserve area. Commissioner Mattheis stated that he would like to have some discussion on the alternatives so that the Commission can give their input and some direction. Mattheis asked about the infill areas and new uses and what is included in those areas. Mr. Bartlam stated that the policies for these areas will be development along with the environmental document. The Mixed Use Centers and the Downtown Mixed Use are intended to give broad policy and then through the Development Code be able to drill down and give a more refined definition of the best uses (i.e. having High Density or Office use directly adjacent to a Retail Center).

Commissioner Olson asked about the process behind the Growth Management process. Mr. Bartlam stated that the Growth Management Program was implemented in 1991. The residential projects that apply for growth management get scored on a variety of levels. The projects that fall in the priority area one or two will get higher points than a project that is in priority area three. Infrastructure and School proximity are also considered in the scoring process. Olson asked if development or impact fees play a part in what is developed. Mr. Bartlam stated that development fees are not a part of the current process. The entire area including the Urban Reserve will need to be a part of the Master Planned for infrastructure purposes.

Chair Kiser asked about an underpass on Century Blvd. Mr. Bartlam stated that the current General Plan does have an underpass on Century as part of the plan. He is also aware that in recent history the City has been thinking of selling their right-of-way adjacent to the rail line. Kiser stated that when the City brought that before the Commission it was the Commissions recommendation not to sell the property. He feels that this is an ideal location for an underpass and would like to see it kept in the new General Plan. Mr. Bartlam stated that it is an appropriate recommendation for the Commission to make.

Commissioner Hennecke asked as follow-up from the last meeting about the Woodbridge area being in the Sphere of Influence. Mr. Bartlam stated that the area has been in the Sphere since before the current General Plan, but the City has no intention of annexing the area.

Chair Kiser called for a brief recess (8:12pm)

Chair Kiser called the meeting back to order (8:19pm)

Hearing Opened to the Public

- Pat Stocker, property owner along Hogan Lane, came forward to comment. Mr. Stocker stated that the Planned Residential Reserve (PRR) designation should be considered as a viable designation for the southern edge of the City. He would like to see a growth management process put in place for the way the retail grows as well. He is concerned that the area on the south east corner of Hwy 99 and Harney Lane will get developed before other areas that have been approved are fully developed. He expressed his concerns for the park area that follows the Woodbridge Irrigation Canal and just how well that has been thought out and how much input the property owners adjacent to it have been given.
- Pat Patrick, CEO Chamber of Commerce, came forward to comment. Mr. Patrick stated that there are three areas of concern; first, the statement by city staff within the plan regarding the wine industry being a focus of growth, the industrial area should be just as much of a focus; and second, the urban growth area to the west should be turned into Urban Reserve because the City has several areas currently on the map in the red hash marks which represents approximately 2500 homes that have already been approved and have no set date for ground breaking; third, the plan seems to be over saturated with retail/commercial areas and he believes in what Mr. Stocker stated regarding some phasing process being implemented for this use also.
- Commissioner Mattheis asked how far out should the area of interest go to the west. Mr. Patrick stated that ideally all the way to I-5, but looking at an area of interest that goes to the RR tracks should be considered.

- Commissioner Kirsten asked about the Chamber's vision for growth in 20, 30, or 40 years. Mr. Patrick stated that infill should be made a priority if the priority is to have a focus on the Wine Industry. Kirsten stated that based on Mr. Patrick's comments the Chamber doesn't want to see the City grow to the west or south. Mr. Patrick stated that if market forces are driving the building then he can see the necessity, but he doesn't believe that it will happen in this plan's time. Kirsten stated that if it isn't planned for and the market starts to drive it then what. Mr. Patrick stated that he is a believer in market forces, but this just seems like a lot.
- Jim Migliori, commercial developer for the area in the SE corner of Hwy 99 and Harney Lane, came forward to express his dislike of the phasing idea for commercial. Commissioner Kirsten asked what is the down side of phasing commercial areas. Mr. Migliori stated that the market drives the building and placement of the centers. The proximity to Hwy 99 makes the area a desirable area for tenants and with the highway overpass improvements scheduled to be made it just makes sense to do the improvements on both sides of the highway at the same time.
- Mike Carouba came forward make comments. Mr. Carouba pointed out the letter sent in by Mr. Costa which was blue sheeted for the Commission. He stated that the meeting that Mr. Bartlam had with interested property owners that had concerns with the Mixed Use Centers must have worked because those people are not in attendance tonight. He would like to see the PRR Designation on the southern edge from the current General Plan kept in place with the new Plan. He would like to see the growth area on the western edge changed to Urban Reserve. He is concerned with the narrow strip of commercial property on the south west corner of Vine Street and Lower Sacramento Road. He would like to see some of the commercial growth areas placed in a Commercial Reserve Designation.

Public Portion of Hearing Closed

- Commissioner Kirsten asked about the Commercial designation on Vine and Lower Sac. Mr. Bartlam stated that the request came from the property owner. It is on a signalized intersection and warrants the designation.
- Commissioner Hennecke asked about the Open Space designation along the Irrigation Canal regarding discussion with property owners along the area. Mr. Bartlam stated that during the stakeholder meetings the Woodbridge Irrigation District stated that they would be open to more discussion on the idea. Hennecke stated that he would like to see all canal areas in the city limits have that designation or none of them. Hennecke asked if the City has ever used its entire 2% residential growth allocations. Mr. Bartlam stated that if you were to look back you may find one or two years where the City met its 2% allocation limit. He also reminded the Commission that the residential growth areas designated on the plan only represent 1.5% residential growth including the pipeline project as identified.
- Vice Chair Cummins asked about the Mixed Use Designation definition that Mr. Costa refers to in his email letter. Mr. Bartlam stated that Mr. Costa was a part of the meeting he held and he is correct with his statement. Cummins asked if there is a standard number of years for a General Plan to span (Stockton has chosen 25). Mr. Bartlam stated that it is historically a 20 year horizon. Cummins asked about the Delta College site and what would be the process in the future if it isn't included in this plan. Mr. Bartlam stated that there has to be some sort of linkage to allow for infrastructure. The question will be what that linkage will look like. If during this next year, the College Board changes its mind about the site, it could be included in the Final Plan.
- Commissioner Mattheis stated that he is not sure the plan is ready to be approved tonight. He prefers to leave the urban growth and Urban Reserve areas to the west in the plan. He does not feel there needs to be a phasing process placed on the Commercial/Retail areas; the market should take care of the need for growth there. The PRR should not be included to the south because that along with the Urban Reserve area would put the City over its 2% potential growth per year for a 20 year plan. A Greenbelt Designation is the direction that we need to be looking in if the City is truly interested in protecting the buffer areas

around the City. The Century Blvd. underpass is a viable solution for traffic in that area and warrants more discussion. When the Alternatives for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) come forward for discussion, Commissioner Mattheis would like to see a more detailed discussion regarding the Delta College site and how it will work in the future plans for the City.

Mr. Bartlam requested a brief recess.

Chair Kiser called for a brief recess (9:10pm)

Chair Kiser called the meeting back to order (9:13pm)

- Chair Kiser stated that he appreciates all the work that has gone into the plan. He would like to see the Delta College site incorporated somehow. The Century Blvd underpass should be left open for discussion.
- Commissioner Hennecke stated his appreciation for the changes in plan and does not see the Delta site as something to hold the plan up for. He believes that if the City Policies call for a 2% growth the General Plan should take that into consideration even if that goal is not met.
- Mr. Bartlam stated that Staff will bring the Alternatives for the EIR that Staff is looking at back to the Commission at a future date for further discussion.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked where the communication stands with the Delta Board. Mr. Bartlam stated that the City Manager has been in discussions with Dr. Rodriguez. Dr. Rodriguez does not want to assume what the new board will want to do and with the main supporter of the project resigning from the board it is a wait and see situation. City Staff has been in support of a possible College site and if we can assist that process by being flexible with our plan it may help.
- Chair Kiser asked what action should be taken at this point.
- Mr. Bartlam stated that based on the Commissions comments he would suggest passing this document on to the Council with the Commissions recommendation.
- Commissioner Mattheis asked about the Alternatives being a part of that recommendation before forwarding it on to the City Council. Mr. Bartlam stated that staff is suggesting that the Delta site and the PRR designation to the south be studied as alternatives in the Environmental Document. The alternatives can't be studied until the Preferred Plan is in place.

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Commissioner Mattheis, Hennecke second, approved the request to consider and recommend to the City Council the Draft Preferred Plan Alternative and report for the General Plan Update. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners – Cummins, Hennecke, Kirsten, Olson, Mattheis, and Chair Kiser
Noes: Commissioners – None
Absent: Commissioners – Heinitz

4. PLANNING MATTERS/FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

None

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Bartlam stated that the Lodi Shopping Center Item will be back before the Commission on January 14, 2009 and the hearing will be held in the Theatre at Hutchins Street Square.

Commissioner Cummins stated that he will not be able to attend the meeting and with Commissioner Mattheis needing to recuse himself Chair Kiser asked if any of the other Commissioners would be

Continued

unable to make the meeting for quorum purposes. The other Commissioners stated that they would be able to attend.

6. ACTIONS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Summary Memo Attached

7. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE/DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE

Mr. Bartlam stated that he recommended to the City Manager that the Development Code should follow the General Plan.

8. ACTIONS OF THE SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

None

9. ART IN PUBLIC PLACES

Commissioner Kirsten stated that he would give an update at the next meeting.

10. COMMENTS BY THE PUBLIC

None

11. COMMENTS BY STAFF AND COMMISSIONERS

None

12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:28p.m.

ATTEST:

Konradt Bartlam
Interim Community Development Director

Lodi General Plan Update



Joint City Council/Planning Commission Meeting

February 11, 2009

Agenda

- **General Plan Update Process**
- **Sketch Plans Public Outreach**
- **Preferred Plan**
 - *Key Concepts*
 - *Citywide Land Use Framework*
 - *Buildout*
 - **Next Steps**


General Plan Update Process

- **Existing Conditions, Trends, Planning Issues**
 - *#1: Land Use, Transportation, Environment and Infrastructure*
 - *#2: Urban Design and Livability*
 - *#3: Growth and Economic Development Strategy*
 - *#4: Greenbelt Conservation Strategies*
- **Sketch Plans**
- **Preferred Plan**
- **General Plan**
- **Environmental Impact Report (EIR)**

Sketch Plans Public Outreach


- **Planning Commission Open House (May 10th)**
 - *Approx. 50 community members attended*
 - *Preference for Sketch Plans B and C*
- **Outreach to Community Groups**
 - *Meetings with 20+ groups*
 - *Preference for Sketch Plan C (with elements of A and B)*






[illegible]

Preservation of Existing Neighborhoods







**Ag/Cluster
Study Area
along
Southern
Boundary**

Mixed-Use Centers/Corridors & Downtown

The map illustrates the Stockton Planning Area, highlighting key urban zones. The 'URBAN RESERVE' is shown in yellow, 'DOWNTOWN' in green, and 'MIXED-USE CENTERS/CORRIDORS' in red. Major thoroughfares such as Sargents Rd, S. Stockton St, and S. California St are clearly marked. The Mokelumne River flows along the eastern edge. A dashed black line delineates a central urban area. A north arrow is located in the bottom right corner.




Street Connectivity and Urban Design; Enhanced Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections; Recreation Path along the Irrigation Canal ROW




Phased Future Development




Mokelumne River as the City's Northern Edge






Buildout: Population, Housing, Jobs



Buildout: Jobs/Employed Residents



Next Steps

- **Decision-Maker Review of Preferred Plan**
- **Development of Key Policies**
- **Draft General Plan**
- **Draft EIR**
- **Community Input (Ongoing)**

Lodi General Plan Update




City Council Meeting


February 11, 2009

Preferred Plan vs. Sketch Plans

COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL BUILDOUT



Population Growth Projections



B-1

Randi Johl

From: Brett S. Jolley [BJolley@herumcrabtree.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 2:39 PM
To: Randi Johl
Cc: Steve Schwabauer; Bruce Fry; jerryfry@mohrfry.com
Subject: Letter and enclosures re tonight's General Plan meeting
Attachments: 89331.pdf; 89338.pdf; Armstrong Letter to CC and PC re Gen Plan.pdf

Dear Randi: Attached please find a 4-page letter and two enclosures for tonight's joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

HERUM\CRABTREE

BRETT S. JOLLEY

T: 209.472.7700 \ F: 209.472.7986
bjolley@herumcrabtree.com

2291 WEST MARCH LANE, Suite B100
STOCKTON, CA 95207

herumcrabtree.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and any accompanying attachment(s) are confidential and privileged. They are intended for the sole use of the addressee. If you receive this transmission in error, you are advised that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance upon the communication or accompanying document(s) is strictly prohibited, and the message should be immediately deleted with any attachment(s). Moreover, any such inadvertent disclosure shall not compromise or waive the attorney-client privilege or confidentiality as to this communication or otherwise. **If you have received this communication in error**, please contact the sender immediately by return electronic mail or by telephone at (209) 472-7700. Thank you.

HERUM CRABTREE

Brett S. Jolley
bjolley@herumcrabtree.com

February 11, 2009

VIA E-MAIL: CITYCLERK@LODI.GOV

Mayor Larry Hansen
And Honorable Members of the Lodi City Council
C/O Randi Johl, City Clerk
City of Lodi
City Hall
221 West Pine Street
Lodi, CA 95241-1910

Chair Wendell Kiser
And Members of the Lodi Planning Commission
C/O Randi Johl, City Clerk
City of Lodi
City Hall
221 West Pine Street
Lodi, CA 95241-1910

Re: Armstrong Road Property Owners' Comments on Proposed Preferred Plan

Dear Mayor Hansen, Chair Kiser, and members of the City Council and Planning Commission:

This office represents the Armstrong Road Property Owners group ("ArmstrongGroup"). My clients object to the Preferred Plan presented to you this evening because it removes and replaces the existing "Planned Residential Reserve" ("PRR") designation from properties north of Armstrong Road with an "Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Area" ["Study Area") designation. These properties should maintain the PRR designation with a Study Area overlay.

As background, the 1991 General Plan describes the PRR designation as follows:

Mayor Larry Hansen
Chairman Weldell Kiser
Member of the City Council and Planning Commission
February 11, 2009
Page 2 of 2

PRR Planned Residential Reserve

This designation is applied to areas between Harney Lane and Armstrong Road, west of State Route (SR) 99, which are well-suited for residential development, but are not expected to develop within the time frame of the GP 2007. Until these areas are redesignated with a nonreserve GP land use designation, allowed uses and development standards shall be the same as those of the agricultural designation.

While the PRR designation applies the areas "well-suited for [future] residential development," the Study Area designation, which replaces the PRR designation in the proposed Preferred Plan is not described in the Land Use Classification System (see p. 4). However the staff report states:

The area to the south reflects the ongoing discussions of creating a County-based plan that we refer to as the Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Areas.

The Armstrong Group submits that these designations are not mutually exclusive and the General Plan should continue to designate this area as PRR with a Study Area overlay.

Including only a Study Area designation (which is not even described in the Plan's Land Use Classification System) without any underlying planning designation effectively surrenders Lodi's planning control over the Armstrong Road corridor: unlike future buildout under the PRR or other zone, any "cluster" development would fall under the County's land use jurisdiction. Stated slightly differently, future "cluster" development is ultimately contingent upon the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors - rather than the Lodi City Council - approving cluster zoning in the Armstrong Road corridor. **Although the Armstrong Group and other landowners in the area support the cluster zone proposal and see such land use as the preferred form of development of their properties,** if the County does not enact cluster zoning legislation, the Study Area designation is meaningless from Lodi and the Armstrong Group's perspectives. To put a finer point on it, what meaning does the Study Area designation carry if the County does not enact cluster zoning legislation? Keeping the PRR designation in place plans for the future and prevents the area from falling into any sort of planning purgatory.

Second, repealing the PRR designation effectively shrinks Lodi's future planning area; an unusual if not unprecedented planning concept. Indeed, in 1991 the City identified this area as "well-suited for residential development" after 2007. Since that time, Lodi's population has increased by nearly one quarter (see Draft Preferred Plan at 1). Moreover, with the approval of Reynolds Ranch in 2006, Lodi saw development begin

Mayor Larry Hansen
Chairman Weldell Kiser
Member of the City Council and Planning Commission
February 11, 2009
Page 3 of 3

to migrate south of Harney Lane. Considering these facts, removing that PRR designation from the Armstrong corridor properties nearly 20 years later would be both counterproductive and counterintuitive.

The General Plan's land use element "functions as a guide to planners, the general public, and decisionmakers as to the ultimate pattern of development for the city or county at build-out...The land use element has a pivotal role in zoning, subdivision, and public works decisions. The element's objectives and policies provide a long-range context for those short term actions." State of California General Plan Guidelines [Governor's Office of Planning and Research, 2003] at 49. Thus, just as the City used the PRR designation in its long-term plan for development between Armstrong and Harney in 1991, at a minimum the City should keep that designation in place for the next cycle of the General Plan. Failing to do so because of pending County legislation or the absence of immediate need does not provide "a long-range context for those short term actions."

Nor would keeping the PRR designation in this area with a Study Area overlay "contradict[] the success achieved to date with regard to funding a [cluster] specific plan" as stated in the Staff Report. Indeed, this conclusion assumes the City must choose between either the PRR designation or the Study Area designation. However, the City can satisfy both objectives by keeping the PRR designation with a Study Area overlay. Indeed, the current PRR designation without a "Study Area" designation has not prevented Lodi from moving forward with supporting the cluster zone concept, so there is no reason to conclude that keeping this designation and adding a "Study Area" overlay would impede any success in such planning. In the end, keeping the PRR designation benefits the City and allows it to tier from its long term planning envisioned in 1991 while at the same time providing avenues for alternative use for the area such as cluster development.

Repealing the PRR designation also violates certain property rights of landowners in the area, including Armstrong Group members. In 1992, relying on the PRR designation, Miriam Fry, Felix Costa, Carl Fink, Vera Perrin, William Beckman, and Charles Beckman ("Owners") entered an agreement with the City in which the Owners agreed to dedicate real property for public use, fund costs of designing and oversizing infrastructure improvements including sewer lines and lift station (approximately \$170,000 in 1992 dollars), and shouldering any "cost to modify the lift station as needed to later serve the area south of Harney Lane at the time of development." (See Enclosure) The Owners specifically entered into and complied with the terms of this agreement because the General Plan planned for and assumed growth would ultimately occur in the PRR area. The undersigned is informed and believes that this infrastructure facilitated development of and serves the Reynolds Ranch/Blue Shield project.

Mayor Larry Hansen
Chairman Weldell Kiser
Member of the City Council and Planning Commission
February 11, 2009
Page 4 of 4

Moreover, in a 1997 letter to Steve Herum demanding further payment from Owners, the Lodi City Attorney noted, "The City entered into an agreement because of a request made by your clients who were seeking to protect and possibly advance the development potential of their property." [See Enclosure] "Failure on the part of the Owners to perform as requested in my judgment puts your clients in breach of the agreement," the City Attorney continued, "Your current clients...have a beneficial interest in the improvements.." The Owners ultimately complied with this demand, investing additional capital into the infrastructure improvements designed to serve properties in the PRR designated area. Thus, in reliance on the PRR designation, Owners spent sufficient capital to vest both common law and contractual property rights in the PRR designation. Revoking this designation after acknowledging Owners' beneficial interest in the improvements runs afoul of protecting property rights. This conclusion also coheres to the Planning Director's statements at the November 12, 2008 hearing that designating the Armstrong area as open space would not be appropriate without "some concessions."

Accordingly, in order to provide planning flexibility, protect property rights, and facilitate the County adopting cluster zoning legislation, the Armstrong Group requests that the Preferred Plan include and describe a PRR designation as reflected in the 1991 General Plan, as well as a Study Area overlay to facilitate proceeding with cluster zone.

Very truly yours,



BRETT S. JOLLEY
Attorney-at-Law

Enclosures: 1992 Agreement between City and Owners
1997 Letter from City Attorney

cc: clients
Steve Schwabauer, City Attorney

JUL 11 1997

CITY HALL
221 WEST FINE STREET
P. O. BOX 3006
LODI, CALIFORNIA 95241-1910
(209) 3336701
(209) 333-6807 FAX

CITY OF LODI

CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

RANDALL A. BAYS
City Attorney

JOHN M. LUEBBERKE
Deputy City Attorney



July 11, 1997

Mr. Steven A. Herum
 Attorney at Law
 P. O. Box 20
 Stockton, CA 95201-3020

Re: Agreement Between City of Lodi & Fry, Fink, Costa, Perrin and Beckman

Dear Mr. Herum:

We are in receipt of your letter of June 10, 1997. The matter has been referred to this office. In order to properly respond I have met with Richard Prima who was involved in the matter originally. I also reviewed the matter from a planning perspective with our Planning and Community Development Director, Rad Bartlam. Additionally, I have reviewed the South Lodi Sanitary Sewer study for the Harney Lift Station Service Area prepared by Kjeldsen-Sinnock & Associates, Inc. The cover of that report indicates that it was prepared for your clients Jeryl Fry, Felix Costa, Cad Fink, Vera Perrin, William Beckman and Charles Beckman. This is the same group of people designated as Owners in the agreement. I have additionally reviewed correspondence from your office authored by yourself and Mr. Thomas H. Terpstra. Review was as well made of City Council minutes and related staff documents. Copies of the draft agreement and the executed agreement were also reviewed.

This review demonstrated one thing very clearly. The City entered into an agreement because of a request made by your clients who were seeking to protect and possibly advance the development potential of their property.

This request is clearly articulated in a letter from Mr. Thomas H. Terpstra dated September 29, 1992. A copy of that letter is attached as Exhibit A to this letter. Based upon that letter, negotiations were undertaken which resulted in the agreement which your then clients designated as "Owners" entered into with the City. In furtherance of that agreement your clients have made at least two payments totaling \$55,084.90 for line oversizing.

Recently, in furtherance of the agreement, City Engineer Richard Prima requested that your clients perform pursuant to paragraph 3 of the agreement, see Exhibit B. Your

July 11, 1997

Re: Agreement Between City of Lodi & Fry, Fink, Costa, Perrin & Beckman

Page 2

clients who are called out as "Owners" in the agreement have failed to perform as requested. The City made its demand for performance at this time since based upon the terms of the signed agreement we were constrained in making such a request until construction of the improvements listed in the agreement was to commence (puzzle solved). An early draft of the agreement would have had the "Owners" providing the required property upon execution of the agreement. However, at the insistence of Mr. Terpstra, the provision was modified. See Exhibit C, McNatt letter.

Failure on the part of the Owners to perform as requested in my judgment puts your clients in breach of the agreement. Under the terms of the agreement the City has no obligation to do anything other than request your client's performance. That has been done. Your current clients (Owners minus one) have a beneficial interest in the improvements which they may wish to save by seeking specific performance on their own behalf. The sizing and location of the improvements is directly for the benefit of your current clients, not for the benefit of the City. We can accommodate the city's needs and the needs of others without these improvements.

Much as the Owners did not bargain for sewer and water lines north of Harney Lane, the City did not bargain for a condemnation action either. The Owners are thwarting performance under the agreement by the City. The Owners should cure the problem. The Owners cannot be in the position of blocking the City's performance while at the same time demanding that the City undertake the expenditure of thousands of dollars for their benefit. In fact, at this time the City has suffered damage because of the Owners non-performance. This damage is in the form of contract engineering costs expended for design services for a lift station and sewer lines which cannot now be built. Expenditures in the range of \$20,000.00 have been made for those services. Continued non-performance on the part of the Owners may result in the City looking to them for recovery of those expenditures.

If you wish to discuss following your review of this letter, please call.

Sincerely,


A. HAYS

City Attorney

RAH/pn

Cc: Dixon Flynn
Richard Prima
Red Bartlam
Robert Sternfels

AGREEMENT

=====

THIS AGREEMENT, is made this _____ day of November, 1992 **by** and between MARIAN M. **FRY**, FELIX COSTA, CARL FINX, VERA PERRIN, WILLIAM BECKMAN and CHARLES BECK " (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Owners") and the CITY OF LODI, a political subdivision of the State of California (hereinafter referred to as "City")

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, Owners have submitted to City a South Lodi Sanitary Sewer Study of the **Harney** Lane Lift Station Area (hereinafter referred to as "Study"), prepared by Kjeldsen-Sinnock & Associates, Inc., Civil Engineers (Exhibit **A**). The Study evaluated the feasibility of extending the Harney Lane Lift Station Service Area to serve the area south of Harney Lane;

WHEREAS, the Lodi City Council, relying on the accuracy of the Study has accepted the technical recommendations of the Study and the City staff report presented at the City Council meeting of October 21, 1992;

NOW. THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises contained herein, the parties agree as follows:

1. Owners shall pay the following:

(a) **Costs** of design and oversizing of **a twenty-four inch (24")** sewer main within **the** limits of the Century Meadows Subdivision, as ~~set~~ forth in Alternative 4 of the Study identified above, in amounts to **be** agreed-upon with and paid directly to the Century Meadows developers.

(b) Costs of preparing plans to City specifications for the above and payment of appropriate engineering and other fees in accordance with City of Lodi written policies and requirements.

(c) Costs of oversizing the lift station, force main, and collector lines entering the lift station, as identified in Exhibit B hereto, payable at the time of approval of construction plans. It is understood that the present cost estimate of oversizing the lift station and force main is approximately One Hundred Ten Thousand Dollars (\$110,000), and the cost of oversizing the collector lines entering the lift station is approximately Sixty Thousand Dollars (\$60,000); per Exhibit B.

(d) Cost to modify the lift station as needed to later serve the area south of Harney Lane at the time of development.

2. Owners will indemnify, defend and hold harmless from and against any and all liability or actions accruing as a result of the City's decision to install such oversized facilities as referred to above, where such action or proceeding arises out of the City's approval of a negative declaration for said facilities.

3. Owners shall, at **such** time as City is prepared to commence construction of the above-described projects, dedicate to City:

(a) The lift station site, Mills Avenue, and adjacent construction easement on the south side of Harney Lane, east of the west section line of Section 23 T3N R6E, MDB&M, as shown in Exhibit C hereto.

(b) Twenty-two feet (22') of street right-of-way plus corner cut-offs per City Standards and construction easement on the south side of Harney Lane from Mills Avenue to the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way, as shown in Exhibit D hereto.

(c) Owners acknowledge that such offer of dedication is necessary concurrently with execution of this agreement since construction of the facilities must occur before development south of Harney Lane in order to serve areas north of Harney Lane which at present have priority under the City's Growth Management Plan.

4. Owners may, at an appropriate future date, apply to City for a reimbursement agreement in accordance with Lodi Municipal Code Chapter 16.40, but nothing herein shall be deemed to obligate the City to approve such reimbursement agreement.


5. Owners acknowledge that because of engineering concerns arising from such oversizing, the trunk sewer line in Harney Lane will require special construction due to its depth and that the number and location of future connections will be limited. Special manholes and/or parallel lines may be needed to serve adjacent property.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have set their hands the day and year first hereinabove mentioned.

"CITY"
CITY OF MDI,
a political subdivision
of the State of California

"OWNERS"

THOMAS A. PETERSON
City Manager



MARIAN M. FRY

ATTEST:



FELIX COSTA

ALICE M. REIMCHE
City Clerk




CARL FINK




VERA PERRIN

Approved As To Form:



WILLIAM BECKMAN

BOBBY W. McNATT
City Attorney



CHARLES BECKMAN


(2)
AGRSEWER/TXTA.01V


South Lodi Sanitary Sewer Analysis

	Existing Master Plan	South Lodi Sar				Phased Construction	
		Alt. 1	Alt. 2			Alt 4-1	Alt. 4-2
Area served:	292 acres North of Harney Ln.	244 acres North of Harney Ln.				244 acres North of Harney Ln.	302 acres South of Harney Ln.
Lift Sta. Location:	Lower Sac. N/Harney	Lower Sac. @ Harney	Mills Ave. @ Harney			Mills Ave. @ Harney	
Lift Sta. Cost:	\$280,000	\$285,000	\$298,000	\$470,000	\$433,000	\$390,000	\$43,000 ³
Oversize Main Cost:	\$67,000	\$70,000	\$92,000	\$227,000	\$211,000	\$127,000	\$84,000 ²
Total Cost:	\$347,000 ¹	\$355,000	\$390,000	\$705,000	\$644,000 ²	\$517,000	\$127,000
Cost above Ex. Plan/Alt. 1 to develop area north Harney:	⁴		\$39,000			\$166,000	
Cost per acre:	\$1,200	\$1,500	\$7,600	\$1,300	\$1,200	\$2,100	\$400

Notes:

- ¹ Costs per Nolte Development Impact Fee Study. ENR updated to July 1992
- ² Costs per Kjeldsen-Sinnock Study, July 1992
- ³ First phase of lift station estimated by City at 90% of total cost
- ⁴ Ex. Master Plan & Alt. 1 assumed to be equivalent at average cost of 1351,000






ARMSTRONG ROAD AGRICULTURAL/CLUSTER STUDY AREA

The Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Area General Plan designation replaces the current PRR general plan designation that was adopted by the City in 1991. At that time the PRR represented the City's "Urban Reserve" designation. The Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Area general plan designation is Intended to be equivalent to the Urban Reserve general plan designation but acknowledges that the City of Lodi and County of San Joaquin are presently studying a proposal by local landowners to create an agricultural zone that provides the landowners with an option to cluster building rights (one building unit for each five acres of land owned by the property owner) in exchange for retaining the remainder of the property for agricultural uses as defined by the proposed ordinance.

It is intended that property designated Armstrong Road Agricultural/Cluster Study Area will have the same rights or status as the new Urban Reserve designation and at least as many rights or the status of the former PRR general plan designation. If the County ultimately does not adopt the proposed land use regulation for the area which is generally defined as one half mile north and one half mile south of Armstrong Road between Interstate Highway 5 and State Highway 99, then this designation shall be treated, interpreted and administered as being equivalent to the Urban Reserve designation.



LEGEND

PRR PLANNED RESIDENTIAL RESERVE

IR INDUSTRIAL RESERVE

FIGURE A-2. RESERVE AREAS (NEW DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL BEYOND 2007)

Lodi General Plan





***Please immediately confirm receipt
of this fax by calling 333-6702***

CITY OF LODI
P.O. BOX 3006
LODI, CALIFORNIA 95241-1910

ADVERTISING INSTRUCTIONS

SUBJECT PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON
THE PREFERRED GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

PUBLISH DATE: SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 2009


LEGAL AD

TEAR SHEETS WANTED: **Three (3) please**

SEND AFFIDAVIT AND BILL TO: RANDI JOHL, CITY CLERK
City of Lodi
P.O. Box 3006
Lodi, CA 95241-1910

DATED: THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 2009

ORDERED BY: RANDI JOHL
CITY CLERK


JENNIFER M. PERRIN, CMC
ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

MARIA BECERRA
ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK

Verify Appearance of this Legal in the Newspaper – Copy to File

LNS Faxed to the Sentinel at 369-1084 at 2:45pm (time) on 1/22/09 (date) 2 (pages)
Phoned to confirm receipt of all pages at _____ (time) _____ CF _____ MB _____ JMP (initials)



DECLARATION OF POSTING

PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE PREFERRED GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

On Friday, January 23, 2009, in the City of Lodi, San Joaquin County, California, a Notice of Public Hearing to Receive Report and Recommendation on the Preferred General Plan Alternative (attached and marked as Exhibit A), was posted at the following locations:

Lodi Public Library
Lodi City Clerk's Office
Lodi City Hall Lobby
Lodi Carnegie Forum

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 23, 2009, at Lodi, California.

ORDERED BY:

RANDI JOHL
CITY CLERK


JENNIFER M. PERRIN, CMC
ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

MARIA BECERRA
ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK



DECLARATION OF MAILING

PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE PREFERRED GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

On Friday, January 23, 2009, in the City of Lodi, San Joaquin County, California, I deposited in the United States mail, envelopes with first-class postage prepaid thereon, containing a Notice of Public Hearing to receive report and recommendation on the preferred General Plan alternative, attached hereto marked Exhibit A. The mailing list for said matter is attached hereto marked Exhibit B.

There is a regular daily communication by mail between the City of Lodi, California, and the places to which said envelopes were addressed.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 23, 2009, at Lodi, California.

ORDERED BY:

RANDI JOHL
CITY CLERK, CITY OF LODI


JENNIFER M. PERRIN, CMC
ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

MARIA BECERRA
ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK



CITY OF LODI

Carnegie Forum
305 West Pine Street, Lodi

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Date: February 11, 2009

Time: 6:30 p.m.

For information regarding this notice please contact:

Randi Johl

City Clerk

Telephone: (209) 333-6702

EXHIBIT A

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

(Special Joint Meeting of Lodi City Council and Lodi Planning Commission)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on **Wednesday, February 11, 2009**, at the hour of 6:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, the City Council and the Lodi Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing at the Carnegie Forum, 305 West Pine Street, Lodi, to consider the following item:

a) Receive Report and Recommendation on the Preferred General Plan Alternative.

Information regarding this item may be obtained in the Community Development Department, 221 West Pine Street, Lodi, (209) 333-6711. All interested persons are invited to present their views and comments on this matter. Written statements may be filed with the City Clerk, City Hall, 221 West Pine Street, 2nd Floor, Lodi, 95240, at any time prior to the hearing scheduled herein, and oral statements may be made at said hearing.

If you challenge the subject matter in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone **else** raised at the public hearing described in this notice or in written correspondence delivered to the City Clerk, 221 West Pine Street, at or prior to the close of the public hearing.

By Order of the Lodi City Council:

City Clerk

Dated: January 7, 2009

Approved as to form:

D. Stephen Schwabauer
City Attorney

General Plan Update – mailing list

EXHIBIT B

	Company	FirstName	LastName	Address1	City	State	Postal Code
1.	J. Manassero			2171 E. Armstrong Rd.	Lodi	CA	95242
2.		Denis	Silber	1050 Port Chelsea Cr.	Lodi	CA	95240
3.	Calif. Valley Miwok Tribe	Silvia	Burley, Chairperson	10601 Escondido Place	Stockton	CA	95212
4.	Ione Band of Miwok Indians	Matthew	Franklin, Chairperson	P.O. Box 1190	Ione	CA	95640
5.	North Valley Yokuts Tribe	Katherine Erolinda	Perez	P.O. Box 717	Linden	CA	95236
6.	Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation	Anthony	Brochini, Chairperson	P.O. Box 1200	Mariposa	CA	95338
7.	Wilton Rancheria	Mary	Daniels- Tarango, Chairperson	7916 Farnell Way	Sacramento	CA	95823
8.	Brookfield Homes	Douglas	Brewer	500 La Gonda Way, Suite 100	Danville	CA	94526

NOTE: CD sent e-notification
to these two lists

Kari Chadwick

Distribution List Name: General Plan Updates

Members:

Brett Jolley	BJolley@herumcrabtree.com
Crystal Kirst	ckirst@grnail.com
Dale Gillespie	dale@rpmcompany.net
Daniel Thigpen	dthigpen@recordnet.com
Denis Silber	dsilber@lodi.usd.net
Douglas Brewer	Dbrewer@brookfieldhomes.com
EJC	ejc_enterprise@verizon.net
Frederick Addison	frederick@uborainc.com
Greg Costa	fcands@lodin.net
Greg Costa	costasquad@verizon.net
Jeff Traverso	j.traverso@sbcglobal.net
Jennifer Alves	jalves@neumiller.com
Jeremy Price	jprice@neumiller.com
Joe	Joe01212@yahoo.com
John Beckman	johnb@biadelta.org
Jon Schrader	JonSchrader@FMBonline.com
Kate Hart	khart@aklandlaw.com
Kelly Stump	kelkel38@aol.com
Kevin Dougherty	kdougherty@fcrai.com
Marty Willett	mwillett@g-rem.com
Mary Jackson	info@ldgga.org
Matt Dobbins	mjdobbins22@msn.com
Michael Caruba	Michael@Duncanda.com
Rick Gerlack	makualike@comcast.net
Rod Attebery	rattebery@neumiller.com
Rosemary Atkinson	rosymoonatk@comcast.net
Russ Munson	Russ@winerose.com
Warmerdam	warmerdam7@sbcglobal.net

Kari Chadwick

Distribution List Name: General Plan Update (2)

Members:

Dale C. Prohaska	turner610@soflwm.net
Dale Gillespie	dale@rpmcompany.net
Matt Dobbins	mjdobbins22@msn.com
Virginia Snyder	virginia2830@att.com